UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,158	05/03/2001	Edwin K. Runyon	74953/11664	7426

23380 7590 03/28/2003

ARTER & HADDEN, LLP
1100 HUNTINGTON BUILDING
925 EUCLID AVENUE
CLEVELAND, OH 44115-1475

EXAMINER	
SWARTHOUT, BRENT	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2632	9

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/848,158	Applicant(s) Runyon
	Examiner Brent A Swarthout	Art Unit 2632

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☑ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2-11-02.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☑ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☑ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7-8.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 7-11, 13-14, 28-30, 34-38 and 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woolard et al. (WO 17984) in view of Conkright et al.

Woolard teaches a method of operating an energy management system comprising providing processing means at plural local facilities 14 to monitor and control the facilities (Fig. 1), connecting the local facilities to the world wide web (abstract), and accessing facility information from a remote location on the world wide web (page 9), the facility control including lighting (Page 14), except for specifically stating that the lighting is for an airfield lighting system.

Conkright teaches desirability of remotely accessing information over the internet about an airfield lighting system (Fig. 1; col. 1, lines 58-63; col. 3).

It would have been obvious to use remotely facility monitoring and control over the internet as taught by Woolard in conjunction with an airfield lighting system as disclosed by Conkright, in order that airfields could have been remotely monitored, thus providing cost savings by not having to have separate monitoring systems and personnel for each airfield.

Regarding claims 7-8, a user, such as a repair person, can access the facility remotely over the internet (page 8, line 19; page 13, lines 19-20).

Regarding claims 10-11, alarm data for a flight can be e-mailed or a user can be paged (page 15, line 6).

2. Claims 19-25, 4, 5, 31-32 and 43-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woolard et al in view of Conkright et al and Townsend (WO 1/22177).

Townsend teaches desirability in a system for controlling facilities over the internet of using a user authorization code (Page 7, lines 1-3).

It would have been obvious to use authorization code as taught by Townsend in conjunction with a monitoring system as disclosed by Woolard and Conkright, in order that only authorized persons had access to facility data.

Regarding claim 5, since Townsend teaches that a user is a client, choosing to allow marketing personnel access to the system would have been obvious, merely depending on who desired facility information.

3. Claims 6, 12, 33 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woolard et al in view of Conkright et al and Steen et al. (WO 62136).

Steen discloses desirability of allowing a customer access to facility information over the internet (abstract; Page 2, line 5), and notification via cellphone (Page 3, line 8).

It would have been obvious to allow customer access and cellphone notification as taught by Steen in conjunction with a system as disclosed by Woolard and Conkright, in order that those in need of facility data could have obtained it more easily.

4. Claims 15-17 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woolard et al in view of Conkright et al and Runyon et al. (642).

Runyon teaches desirability of transmitting data in an airfield lighting system to a processor via wires, fiber optics or wirelessly (col. 4, lines 20-21 and 51-54).

It would have been obvious to utilize any of wires, wireless or fiber optic communications as disclosed by Runyon in conjunction with an airfield lighting system data access system as disclosed by Woolard and Conkright, in order to allow for use of lines already in place, or more efficient or less costly/complex communications as desired.

5. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woolard et al in view of Conkright et al and Norman et al. (340).

Norman discloses desirability of providing location data to a processor in addition to data related to airfield lighting (abstract).

It would have been obvious to include additional airfield data as taught by Norman in conjunction with an airfield data access system as disclosed by Woolard and Conkright, in order that additional aircraft location data could have been provided to concerned users.

6. Claims 26, 27 and 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woolard et al in view of Conkright et al, Townsend and Moore.

Moore teaches desirability in a monitoring system over a network of storing information about repair history entered by a

technician (col. 8, lines 2-14) and of triggering part replacement process when a part is used so that inventory can be maintained (col. 10, lines 50-62).

It would have been obvious to use a server as taught by Moore to monitor repair history and part usage in conjunction with a system as disclosed by Woolard, Conkright and Townsend, in order that facility monitoring, repair status and inventory could have all been accessible through a single system.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Nolet discloses an inventory monitoring system.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent Swarthout whose telephone number is (703) 305-4383. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Wu, can be reached on (703) 308-6730. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Brent Swarthout

BRENT A. SWARTHOUT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

BS/ayc

March 19, 2003